



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY.

VOL. I.

No. 3.

I.—VERRIUS FLACCUS.

I.

The great work of Verrius Flaccus *De Verborum Significatu*, which may, I suppose, claim the title of the first Latin Lexicon ever written, is unfortunately only known to us in fragments and abridgments. Of these abridgments one is completely, the other only incompletely preserved. I will speak of the latter first. Its author, Pompeius Festus, probably lived in the second century A. D., as he is quoted by Julius Romanus, a grammarian of the beginning of the third century, (ap. Charisium II 220 Keil). The work of Festus now exists only in fragments, for the text of which we are dependent upon a single manuscript. If we may judge by his own utterances, his pretensions to scholarly endowment must have been small. He goes about his business in the truly destructive spirit of utilitarian learning. Festus, 218 (Müller): "cuius (Verrii) opinionem neque in hoc neque in aliis compluribus refutare mihi nunc necesse est, cum propositum habeam ex tanto librorum eius numero intermortua iam et sepulta verba atque ipso saepe confidente nullius usus aut auctoritatis praeterire, et reliqua quam brevissime redigere in libros admodum paucos." Festus, it will be seen, has a pedantic contempt for all information not useful in his own time, and no scruple in setting up his own judgment against that of Verrius Flaccus. And thus he has evidently omitted much which in the second century would perhaps have been thought

profitless, but which in the nineteenth would be regarded as invaluable. Like a true pedagogue, he has no misgivings. He has none of the perhaps exaggerated but still salutary reverence for Latin antiquity which is so conspicuous in other writers of the second century, such as Fronto and Aulus Gellius, nor does he give any proof of independent critical power. His work is merely an affair of scissors and paste, in which conceit and incompetence are perhaps equally blended.

It is the Nemesis of free speculation, science, and literature, that they are born of practical necessities, and only continue to exist by stooping to serve them. One trembles to think what might have been the fate of Vergil and Horace had not their poems been early converted into lesson-books for schoolboys. The great work of Verrius suffered severely under the operation to which Festus subjected it; but its life was probably saved thereby. And Festus was in his turn overtaken by a righteous retribution at the time of the Carolingian revival. His book was then further abridged by Paulus, who, in the dedication of his epitome to Charles the Great, states that he has passed over everything superfluous and unnecessary which the prolixity of Festus had suffered to remain.

How much Festus omitted from the original work of Verrius Flaccus cannot be ascertained. But a comparison between Festus and Paulus in the passages common to both shows that a not inconsiderable number of glosses which still remained in Festus were left out by his epitomator. In the glosses which he retained Paulus seems to have made it his chief business to cut away the references to old Latin authors which Festus had still allowed to remain in illustration of the articles of Verrius. But this was not all. There are cases in which it can be shown that the epitome of Paulus sometimes attributes to Verrius views which we know from other sources that he did not hold. Thus on p. 2 Paulus says on the word *amoenus* "*amoena* dicta sunt loca quae ad se amanda adliçant." But from Isidore XIV 9, 33, we learn that Verrius Flaccus derived *amoenus* from *munus*: "*amoena* loca dicta Varro ait eo quod solum amorem praestent et ad amanda adliçant: Verrius Flaccus, quod sine munere sint, nec quicquam in his officii, quasi *amunia*, id est sine fructu," etc. In the same way on p. 17 Paulus gives an account of the name Angerona, which it appears from Macrobius (Sat. I 10, 7) was the one accepted, not by Verrius Flaccus, but by Julius Modestus. It is sufficiently evident therefore that the epitome of Paulus gives but an inadequate idea, in

point both of compass and of matter, of the work which it is supposed to represent.

About the life of Verrius Flaccus himself we know no more than what is stated by Suetonius in the seventeenth chapter of his treatise *De Grammaticis*. He was a freedman, and obtained renown chiefly by his method of teaching. This seems to have been neither more nor less than the introduction of the principle of competition. "To exercise the wits of his pupils," says Suetonius, "he used to pit against each other those of the same age, give them a subject to write upon, and reward the winner with a prize, generally in the shape of a fine or rare copy of some ancient author. For all this he was chosen by Augustus as tutor to his grandchildren at a salary of about £1000 a year (centena sestertia), on the condition of his taking no other pupils. From this time onwards he resided on the Palatine and gave his lectures in the *atrium* of the house of Catulus. He died an old man in the reign of Tiberius. He had a statue erected to his memory at Praeneste, where he had set up, engraved on marble, a calendar of his own arrangement.¹ His character and manner of study were attacked, we know not for what reason, by a contemporary scholar Scribonius Aphrodisius, a slave and pupil of Horace's master Orbilius. From all this it would appear that Verrius Flaccus was favored by most of the outward circumstances that a scholar could wish for, leisure, long life, a competence, general appreciation, and good society. Besides his encyclopaedic work, the *De Verborum Significatu*, of which I wish to speak in detail in these essays, he wrote books *rerum memoria dignarum*, of which Gellius (IV 5, 6) quotes the first, and of which Pliny has apparently preserved something. He also wrote a treatise *De Obscuris Catonis*, which is cited by Gellius (XVII 6, 2), and another on Etruscan antiquities (Scholia Veronensia on Aen. X 183 and 200). We also hear of a pamphlet on the god Saturnus (Macrobius I 4, 7; 8, 5), and of letters (*epistolae*) on literary subjects (Servius on Aen. VIII 423.)

The abridgments of the *De Verborum Significatu* which I mentioned above are now most familiarly known to scholars in the edition published by Karl Otfried Müller at Leipzig in 1839. Not so much has been done since that time as might have been expected for the criticism of Festus and Paulus, although a great deal of attention has been given to later glossaries. I was led towards the

¹ The remains of this calendar are edited in the first volume of the Berlin Corpus Inscriptionum.

end of 1879, while studying the criticisms on Vergil in Macrobius, to the opinion that some of those which relate to Vergil's employment of rare or antique expressions may be ultimately traced to Verrius Flaccus; and this conclusion induced me to investigate the relation of some other later Latin writings to the same author, and ultimately to enquire in detail into the general character of the *De Verborum Significatu*, the authorities on which it is mainly based, the form in which it is composed, and its general scope and aim. I found that, although Müller is to all appearance right in his main ideas as to the composition of the work, and more right, probably, than some recent scholars have been disposed to allow in his view of the relation of the glosses of Festus to those of Placidus, much still remains to be said both on the original work of Verrius and on the remains of it which, in my opinion, may be discovered in later writers, notably in Quintilian, Gellius, Nonius, Macrobius, and Placidus.

I hope to contribute something in these two essays towards an elucidation of both these points, and propose in the first to say a few words on the composition and general character of the *De Verborum Significatu*, so far as they can be inferred from the abridgements through which alone we know anything of it.

It is a characteristic of the literature of the Augustan age, in its various branches, that it tends to sum up the results arrived at separately by writers of previous generations. In the sphere of style this epoch produced classical masterpieces, the works of Vergil, Horace, Livy and Ovid; in that of philology and antiquities it produced works of reference, such as those of Hyginus, Fenestella, and Verrius Flaccus. The work of Verrius Flaccus may fairly claim to be called an encyclopaedia. Its title, *De Verborum Significatu*, gives but an inadequate idea of its contents, which embrace not only lexicographical matter, but much information on points of history, antiquities, and grammar, illustrated by numerous quotations from poets, jurists, historians, old legal documents, and writers on religious or political antiquities.

In ancient Italy the connection between literature and scholarship was organic, the study of philology having been almost as old as the creation of a national poetry. Livius Andronicus and Ennius¹ were not only poets, but interpreters of Greek. And their own

¹ Suetonius De Grammaticis I: "Antiquissimi doctorum, qui idem et poetae erant et semigraeci, Livium et Ennium dico, quos utraque lingua domi forisque docuisse adnotatum est, nihil amplius quam Graecos interpretabantur," etc.

works also soon began to be used as quarries for the scholar. In the train of the early masters of Latin poetry, Plautus, Naevius, Ennius, and the early tragedians and satirists, followed a crowd of interpreters who devoted themselves to the exposition of their works. This fact is partly due to the very nature of poetic diction; but there were also peculiar circumstances in the case before us which encouraged the growth of a science of interpretation. Since Plautus and Ennius hardly any Latin poetry was written without a study of Greek; and Italian style became more and more colored with a tinge of Greek language and inflection. Thus it came about that the Latin poets, whether they admitted Greek words into their verses, or gave new life to dying Italian words which the new fashion was banishing from common use, were not always easy to understand. A double interest was growing up among the literary public. There was a desire to understand the older poets; there was also a desire to follow and continue their work as step by step was built up the fabric of Italian literature. Their productions were soon used as materials both for the education of youth and for the study of the professed scholar. Thus we find Octavius Lampadio busy with Naevius; Q. Vargunteius and Pompilius Andronicus with Ennius; Aelius Stilo, Volcatius Sedigitus, Servius Clodius, Aurelius Opilius, Sisenna and Varro with Plautus; Laelius Archelaus, Vettius Philocomus and Curtius Nicia with Lucilius. The study of grammar, which had been much furthered by the labors of the poets Accius and Lucilius, was developed by Julius Caesar, Varro and Nigidius Figulus. It is less remarkable, owing to the obvious practical necessities of the case, that a long line of interpreters of Roman law can be traced as far back as the end of the third century B. C. At the head of this line stand the names of Publius and Sextus Aelius Paetus (consuls respectively 201 and 198 B. C.) Finally, the encyclopaedic labors of Varro, ranging from history, law and antiquities to poetry and grammar, embodied in various works much of the material amassed by previous scholars.

The work of Verrius Flaccus is, so far as I know, the first attempt in the history of Latin literature at compiling an encyclopaedia of scholarship in the form of a dictionary alphabetically arranged. But long before his time it would appear that smaller works of the same kind had been attempted in the shape of glossaries to poets and legal documents. References to such works are to be found in the *De Lingua Latina* of Varro. In discussing the word *tesca*, Varro (Ling. Lat. VII, 10) quotes the opinion of persons *qui*

glossas scripserunt: and in the same book (107) on the word *persibus* he says *sub hoc glossema callide subscribunt*. It should be observed that in the seventh book of the *De Lingua Latina*, where Varro is discussing poetical words, there are in some passages distinct traces of an alphabetical arrangement. From § 9-12, for example, we have *templum tesca tueri*: from § 43-51 *ancile catus cobium cortina duellum lugula supremum tempestas*: from § 88-92 *alcyon comiter capio cicurare ferme*: from § 98-101 *cerno frequens fossari mussare*. This fact seems to point to the conclusion that Varro was drawing upon glossaries alphabetically arranged, written either to single poets or to several in combination. But we have further indications of the existence of such works. Verrius Flaccus (Festus 181 M.) quotes a *liber glossematorum* by Ateius Philologus, a celebrated scholar of the Ciceronian age, and elsewhere mentions *glossarum libri*. Santra, a scholar of the same period as Ateius, wrote an important etymological treatise *De verborum antiquitate*, which it is natural to suppose must have been of a lexicographical character. About the same time Aelius Gallus compiled a great work, *De significatione verborum quae ad ius civile pertinent*. And there may, indeed there must, have been many *compendia* or handbooks of interpretation or etymology in circulation for the purposes of ordinary education and reading. Festus, 210, has made mention of *commentarii quidam*. *Glossae antiquitatum, glossae veterum*, are also mentioned by Julius Cominianus, a grammarian of the fourth century (Charisius 229, 242, Keil).

Even in the ruins in which it lies, it is easy to see how large must have been the proportions of Verrius Flaccus' work. Festus speaks of reducing a great number of books to a few. This means, not that Verrius' work was not arranged alphabetically, but that each letter was divided into books, which Festus reduced until no more than one book was left for each letter. This agrees with Festus' own quotation (326) from Verrius' *fifth book* of words beginning with the letter *P*. Whatever the number of books under each letter, Festus reduced them in every case to one, in which it is now barely possible to trace the lines of any division at all.

Some idea of the original extent of the work of Verrius Flaccus, and of what it has suffered at the hands of Festus and Paulus, may be gathered from the quotations of Gellius. In V 18 of his *Noctes Atticae*, Gellius quotes a remark of Verrius on the difference between *annales* and *historia* which is not in Festus at all; in V 17 we have a citation from a very full account of the phrase *dies*

atri or *nefasti*, originally given in Verrius' fourth book; and in XVI 14 an account of the etymology of *festino*, which must have belonged to the note preserved by Festus 234, but which has disappeared from the epitome. In the same way Gellius XVIII 7, 5, quotes a *liber* of Verrius Flaccus (did this belong to the *De Verborum Significatu*?) in which the meanings of *senatus civitas tribus* and *decuria* are discussed at length, but of which Festus has preserved no trace. Even the fuller notes of Festus himself sometimes preserve a surprising number of examples, which give a tantalizing idea of the fullness of learning which we have lost.

Turning now to the works of Festus and Paulus, let us ask what they tell us of the scope and intention of their original. As I said above, the title of Verrius' work *De Verborum Significatu* might lead us to expect that its purpose was simply lexicographical in the narrower sense of the word. But this is not the case. There is a great number of articles which would now be relegated to a dictionary of history or mythology; others would be regarded as belonging to a dictionary of antiquities. Such are under the letter *A* the notes on *Ambrones*, *Ausonia*, *Ameria*, *Anxur*, *Ariminum*; under *B* those on *Beneventum* and *Bruttates*; under *C* those on *Collatia*, *Capua*, *Caecilius*, *Calpurnius*; under *M* those on *Misenum*, *Messapia*, *municipium*, *Mamilius*, *Mamertini*; under *R* that on *Roma*; under *S* that on *Saturnia*; and many other instances of the same kind might be added.

Again, there was a great deal of discussion on points of grammar and orthography. Such are the remarks on the gender of words, as under *A* on *armentum*; under *C* on *contio*, *contagio*, *clunes*; under *D* on *demus* and *demum*; under *F* on *frons*; under *M* on *parens* and *crux* (p. 151); p. 198 on *obsidio* and *obsidium*; p. 250 on *amnis*; p. 286 on *agnus*; p. 313 on *stirps*. Verrius noticed also such points of form as the declension of nouns, comparison of adjectives, and conjugation of verbs. Instances of this are his remarks (p. 4) on the defective *ambest*; p. 27 on *aliae* and *alius*; p. 81 on *exercitior* and *exercitissimus*, *exfuti* and *effusi*; p. 92 on *falsius* and *falsior*; p. 103 on *im* = *eum*; p. 107 on *incensit* for *incenderit*, *incepsit* for *inceperit*; p. 154-5 on *magnificior* and *munificior* for *magnificentior* and *munificentior*; p. 163 on *neminis* from *nemo*; p. 181 on *ocius* and *ocissime*; p. 247 on *pecuum* from *pecus*; p. 286 on *repulsior*, *ratissima*. There is also evidence to show that he must have given a great deal of attention to points of orthography. On p. 15, for instance, we find a notice of the spelling

amecus for *amicus*; on p. 62 of *consiptum* for *conseptum*; on p. 72 of *distisum* and *pertisum* for *distaesum* and *pertaesum*; on p. 99 of the writing *heluo*. According to Charisius, Verrius Flaccus asserted that *camara* should be spelt with an *a*, not with an *e*; that *alica* had no *h*; that *manubiae* should be written *manibiae*; that *nomenclator* should be spelt without a *u* (Charis. 58, 96, 97, 106 Keil). Charisius has also preserved observations of Verrius on the gen. pl. of *panis*, the gender of *clunes*, the forms *lacte*, *labra*, *labia*, and the acc. pl. *ambo* for *ambos* (141, 101, 102, 103, 119). Notwithstanding the frequency of these grammatical remarks (and more might be added to the list), the work of Verrius was in the main a Latin lexicon; the first, I suppose, that was ever written. The chief authorities from which illustrations were drawn are, so far as can be learned from our abridgments, the following: the *Carmina Saliorum*, the laws of the twelve tables, the *libri pontificum* and the *carmina* of Marcius; the poets Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius, Plautus, Caecilius, Pacuvius, Accius, Afranius, Terence, Lucilius, Atta, Titinius, Hostius, Turpilius, Novius, Pomponius, Lucretius, Catullus, Varro, Vergil and Ovid; the historians Cato, Sisenna, and Sallust; the orators and rhetoricians Cato, Scipio Africanus, Annii Luscus, Gaius Gracchus, Laelius, Scipio Aemilianus, Sulpicius Rufus, Cornificius, Cicero and Calidius; the scholars and antiquarians Fabius Pictor, Cincius, Aelius Stilo, Aurelius Opilius, Varro, Ateius Philologus, Ateius Capito, Antistius Labeo, Aelius Gallus, Veranius, and Valgius Rufus.

Among these authors the most frequently quoted are, I think, Accius, Afranius, Caecilius, Cato, Ennius, Lucilius, Naevius, Pacuvius, Plautus, and Varro.

The list ranges from the earliest monuments of Latin literature to the Augustan age; the citation latest in date being from Ovid, from whom our abridgments have preserved only one instance.

Let us now enquire how far the work of Verrius was original, and to what extent he drew upon previous authorities.

As Verrius wrote a book upon Cato, and also one upon orthography, it is reasonable to suppose that his numerous quotations from Cato and the remarks on orthography of which I have given examples, are the result of his own researches. Müller thinks that the notes upon Cato were taken by Festus from the treatise of Verrius *De Obscuris Catonis*, and inserted by him in his abridgment of the *De Verborum Significatu*. We have nothing here but conjecture to guide us; but it would seem more natural to

suppose that Verrius included his own notes on Cato in his greater work. Had Festus taken as much trouble as Müller's theory would imply, he would probably have informed his readers of the fact. Verrius may have written his special treatises, such as the *De Orthographia* and the *De Obscuris Catonis*, while his great work was in progress or even before it was begun, and afterwards embodied their contents in it.

So much, therefore, of Verrius' work is probably original, or at least independent. I am disposed to think the same of the notes on Vergil. Nothing would be more natural than that Verrius should add instances from a recent poet, one of whose most prominent characteristics was a love of reviving old words. And I do not know that there is any evidence that any one before Verrius Flaccus wrote glossaries or a glossary to Vergil. It would be interesting to know what were the sources of his notes on Catullus, Lucretius and Cicero; whether they were his own, or drawn from commentators or index-makers now forgotten. It is certainly strange that Festus and Paulus have not preserved a single note from Varro's *Saturae*. This, however, I am disposed to think, is an accident. For some of the lexicographical notes in Nonius, which can, as I hope to show in my second essay, be proved to come from Verrius Flaccus, are illustrated from the *Saturae*, and I infer therefore that Verrius had many instances from them collected either by himself or by others.

With regard to the older poets, Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Plautus, Ennius, Caecilius, Afranius, Terence and Lucilius, we may be morally certain that Verrius, whether he had made an independent study of these writers or not, drew largely upon the works of the commentators and glossographers who had illustrated them. Besides the *glossematum scriptores* whom he cites in the note on the word *naucum* (Festus, 166), he several times mentions Aurelius Opilius, the commentator on Plautus. The note on *examussim* (Festus, 80) can be shown by a comparison of a passage in Charisius (p. 198 Keil) to have been taken from Sisenna's Plautine commentaries. Numerous quotations from Lucilius are preserved by the epitomators. These may have been collected by Verrius himself, but we should remember that we know of three scholars who had worked at Lucilius before him, Laelius Archelaus, Vettius Philocomus and Curtius Nicia. We have the evidence of Verrius himself that he drew largely upon the works of Aelius Stilo, the master of Varro, from whom (Festus, 210) he quotes a comment on the

carmen saliare, another (p. 290) on the twelve tables, and others (pp. 359 and 372) on the comedians and on Plautus, and to whom he often refers on questions of etymology and interpretation. On similar questions we often find him citing the work of Santra *de antiquitate verborum*. Ateius Philologus is used in the same way; on one occasion (Festus, 181, s. v. *ocrem*) his *liber glossematorum* being specially referred to. He received assistance also from his contemporaries the poet-scholar Valgius Rufus, Ateius Capito and Sennius Capito. As Festus does not name any definite works by Sennius Capito, we may perhaps conjecture that his contributions were paid in the way of personal intercourse or correspondence. On matters of law it is common for Verrius to cite Antistius Labeo, the work of Aelius Gallus *de significatione verborum quae ad ius civile pertinent*, and the legal commentaries of the augur Messala. Antistius Labeo, Ateius Capito and Veranius are also referred to on questions of religious usage. Points of historical antiquity are often illustrated from the writings of the antiquarian Cincius. The numerous notes on the names and early history of Italian cities I should suppose to be derived from the *Origines* of Cato; and it is also possible that Verrius obtained some assistance on these points from his contemporary Iulius Hyginus, who, in his book *De urbibus Italicis*, had treated the same subject.

It is hardly necessary to say that Verrius drew largely upon the stores of historical and antiquarian information collected by Varro. But he quotes Varro more as an antiquarian than as a scholar. That the *Antiquitates* and the books *Rerum Humanarum* were used may be perceived even from the abridgment of Festus; but from the *De Lingua Latina* there are hardly any quotations. Too much stress should not be laid on this fact alone, considering the fragmentary character of the *compendia* by Festus and Paulus. Müller, indeed, goes so far as to assert that Verrius had not even read the *De Lingua Latina*. We are, perhaps, hardly warranted in drawing so extreme a conclusion; but a detailed comparison of the *De Lingua Latina* and of Festus, where the two works treat of the same words, puts it beyond dispute that Verrius Flaccus, though using the same authorities as Varro, was quite independent of him in his treatment of questions connected with the interpretation of words. I have examined a great number of passages in Varro and Festus which bear upon this point, and have found that in many cases their notes are independent, and in many more not only that they are independent, but that Verrius must have added matter and quotations which are not in Varro.

A remarkable difference between Varro and Verrius is to be observed in the matter of etymology. To judge from the epitome of Paulus, it would certainly seem as though Verrius had a predilection for deriving Latin words from Greek. It would be rash, perhaps, to infer that such was really the fact; for it may be merely that Verrius was careful to mention a Graecizing etymology whenever such a one had been proposed by any respectable authority. Be this, however, as it may, there can be no doubt that Verrius is much more partial to the Graecizing process than Varro. There seem to have been two main schools of etymology among the Romans, one of which preferred explaining Latin words by a Latin origin, while the other was fond of referring them, where possible, to a Greek source. Varro, if we may judge by the *De Lingua Latina*, belonged decidedly to the former class. Thus we find that in discussing the word *amnis* Verrius connects the Latin preposition *am* with the Greek ἀμφί, which Varro does not; and the like is the case with the words *angulus*, *agnus*, *annus* and *orator*. Who were the representatives of the Graecizing school of etymology before Verrius Flaccus it is not easy to ascertain with certainty. The notes in Festus on *dativus* (p. 68), on *nuptiae* (p. 170), and on *spinturnix* (p. 333), show that Santra was not averse to the Graecizing method, and Aelius Stilo (p. 174 *si lectio certa*) is said to have compared *novalis* with νεώζ, and (p. 206) to have derived *petaurista* from πρὸς τὸν ἀέρα πέτασθαι. In other cases, however, the etymologies cited from Aelius Stilo show no trace of this tendency. The name which survives as most definitely representing the Graecizing school is that of Hypsicrates, "cuius libri sane nobiles sunt super his quae a Graecis accepta sunt" (Gellius XVI 12, 6). This Hypsicrates is quoted by Varro, *De Lingua Latina* V 88, and also by Verrius Flaccus (Paulus s. v. *aurum*). There is another scholar mentioned by Gellius as pushing the Graecizing method to an extreme, even to the extreme of deriving *fenerator* from φαίνεσθαι. This was Cloatius Verus' (Gellius XVI 12), the author of a treatise in several books bearing the title *verborum a Graecis tractorum*. Teuffel conjectures that Cloatius Verus lived in the time of the Antonines (Gesch. der Röm. Lit. § 338, 5). There seems to be no ground for this supposition beyond the fact that he is quoted by Gellius, and I think it is therefore worth while to ask the question whether Cloatius Verus is not the same as the Cloatius quoted several times by Verrius Flaccus on matters relating to sacrifices. One of Cloatius' etymologies, that which connected the

words *alucinatio* and *elucus*, and both with the Greek ἀλβειν (Gellius l. c.) is still to be found in Paulus; p. 24 "*alucinatio* erratio"; p. 75 "*elucum* significat languidum et semisomnum, vel ut alii volunt *alucinatorem* et nugarum amatorem, sive *halonem*." But it is no doubt rash to hazard a conjecture on so uncertain a matter.

I now come to a point the full consideration of which will, I think, be found to throw a great deal of light on the manner in which the work of Verrius Flaccus, and indeed a large part of similar work in antiquity, was composed.

Müller, in the preface to his edition, has observed four points in the arrangement of the books as we have them in their abridged form. (1) Each book may be divided into two parts, in the first of which regard is paid not only to the first letter of each word, but also to the second, and sometimes to the third. (2) The same word is often interpreted twice over, the writer sometimes giving different explanations in the different places. A word so repeated may occur in the first and the second part of each book, but never occurs twice in the first part. (3) In the second part of every letter we find a series of glosses illustrated from Cato, some from Plautus, and some remarks on religious law arranged together. (4) At the beginning of some letters we find words of religious signification placed apparently by way of good omen, as *Augustus* at the beginning of *A*, *Lucetium Iovem* at the beginning of *L*, *magnos ludos, Meltom*, and *Matrem Matutam* at the beginning of *M*, *naenia* at the beginning of *N*. This arrangement is not always preserved in our epitome, a fact which Müller puts down to the havoc made by Festus with the original work.

Müller also notices that the quotations from the contemporaries of Verrius Flaccus, Veranius and Antistius Labeo, are to be found at the end of the letters in which they occur, *M*, *O*, *P* and *R*. And he infers from this that these citations, like those from Cato, were inserted by Festus from other works of Verrius Flaccus.

The facts elicited by Müller are undeniable, but they are not all. There is another fact which has apparently escaped his notice, and which goes far, in my opinion, toward justifying us in raising the question whether he has hit on the true explanation of the arrangement of the articles in Festus.

There are some traces even in the epitome of Paulus, and many more in the larger work of Festus, that Verrius arranged his instances under each letter *in successive series, each of which contained glosses headed by citations from the same author*. Müller

noticed that many of the letters in Festus and Paulus are concluded by a series of examples from Plautus and Cato. But I wish to point out that not only in the second part and at the end of the letters, but in the first part and throughout them, there are distinct traces not only of Cato and Plautus, but of many other authors, having been used in the same way. At the risk of being tedious I must go into the details of a phenomenon which has so important a bearing on the problem before us. Taking the letter *A*, I have observed that on p. 4 Ennius is quoted twice, on p. 11 Livius Andronicus twice, on p. 27-28 Plautus twice, on p. 29 Naevius twice. Under the letter *B* on p. 35-36 there are six quotations from Plautus. Under *C* on p. 45 there are two quotations from Plautus, on p. 59 two from Ennius and four from Cato, on p. 60-63 twenty-four from Plautus, and on p. 62 two from Ennius. Under *F* on p. 92 there are three quotations from Cato. Under *G* on p. 96-97 there are two from Plautus. Under *I* on p. 108 there are two from Pacuvius, p. 109-110 two from Plautus, and p. 113 two from Plautus. Under *M*, p. 123, there are two from Ennius, p. 125-7-8 three from Plautus, p. 138-141 two from Aelius Stilo, p. 144 three from Ennius, p. 152 three from Cato, p. 153 two from Ennius, p. 154 six from Cato, p. 157 several from books of augural discipline. Under *N*, p. 161-2, Plautus is quoted four times, Livius Andronicus twice and Cato thrice, p. 165-66 Plautus six times and Ennius thrice, on p. 169 Plautus four times and Cato thrice, on p. 170 Plautus twice and Afranius twice, on p. 174 Livius Andronicus twice and Accius twice, on p. 177 Caecilius and Ennius each twice and Cato twice. Under *O* on p. 178 Ennius is cited twice, p. 181 Plautus twice, on p. 152-5 Cato thrice, p. 198-201 Ennius four times, on p. 201 C. Gracchus twice and Cato thrice. Under *P*, p. 205, we have two avowed and probably more unavowed citations from the *Carmen Saliare*, on p. 206-209 two from Lucilius, on p. 211-13 three from Lucilius, p. 215-217 five from Plautus, p. 217 two from Naevius and as many from Pacuvius, on p. 229 three from Caecilius, three from Plautus and two from Pacuvius, on p. 233-4 several from books of law and antiquities, on p. 234-7 six from Cato, on p. 238 two from Ateius Capito, on p. 241-2 three from Ennius, p. 242 thirteen from Cato, p. 245 several from books of augury and law, p. 249 two from Ennius, 249-253 several from Antistius Labeo, p. 253 two from Cato and others from books on augury, and p. 254 is taken up with notes on antiquities. Under *Q*, p. 257, there are two citations from Ennius, p. 258-9 two from

Ennius and as many from Plautus. Under *R*, p. 270-273, we have four from Lucilius, p. 273 two from Plautus, p. 270-274 three from Pacuvius, p. 274 two from Plautus, p. 277 three from Plautus, two from Lucilius and as many from Afranius, p. 277-8 three from Ennius and several from books of antiquities, p. 278-81 four from Pacuvius, p. 281 two from Accius, p. 281-2 five from Cato, p. 282 two from Plautus, p. 285-6 four from Ennius, p. 286 five from Cato, p. 289-90 several from books of religious antiquities. Under *S*, p. 291-3, we have several quotations from books of antiquities, on p. 294 Lucilius is quoted twice, p. 294-8 Plautus four times, p. 298 Ennius four times, p. 298-301 Lucilius twice, p. 301 Ennius twice, p. 301-2 Plautus four times, p. 302-305 Plautus five times and Ennius thrice, p. 306 Plautus four times, p. 309 books of antiquities, on p. 310 Lucilius and Plautus each twice, p. 313-14 Ennius three times, p. 314-17 books of antiquities, p. 317 Caecilius twice, p. 317-18 books of augural discipline, p. 318 Cato twice, p. 321-2 Naevius and the twelve tables each twice, p. 329-30 Ennius six times, Plautus thrice and Pacuvius twice, p. 333 Ennius twice and Plautus twice, p. 334 Afranius twice, p. 336 9 Ennius thrice, p. 339 Caecilius twice, p. 343-4 books of antiquities, p. 343 Ennius and Pacuvius each twice, p. 344 Cato eight times, p. 348-51 Antistius Labeo seven times, p. 351 Ateius Capito twice. Under *T*, p. 351, Varro is cited twice, p. 351-2 Ennius four times, p. 352 Pacuvius twice, p. 355 Plautus twice, Afranius twice and Caecilius twice, p. 355-6 Pacuvius three times, p. 356 Ennius three times, p. 359-63 Ennius four times, p. 366 Plautus twice. Under *V*, p. 368-9, we have three quotations from Plautus, p. 369 two from Cato and two from Ennius, p. 372 two from Plautus and as many from Pacuvius, p. 375-6 four from Ennius, p. 378-9 six from Cato. It should also be observed that the citations from the poets usually come together, and the same is true of those from the orators and the books of historical or religious antiquities.

Müller has shown that in several cases where a quotation from Plautus or Cato does not appear in the epitome of Paulus or Festus, the word annotated occurs in the works of those writers, and that we may therefore reasonably infer that if it occurs in a series of words which are undoubtedly from Plautus or Cato, it was probably illustrated, in the original work of Verrius Flaccus, from the works of one or the other. Thus Müller has added the name of Plautus to three glosses now unnamed, in Paulus p. 35-36, and nine to the list of fifteen p. 60-63. A similar process should be applied, so far

as possible, to the citations from other authors, before this part of our subject can be pronounced exhausted.

Arguing on the facts before him, Müller concluded that Verrius jotted down his notes and extracts on separate sheets, in no definite order, and thus gave them to his scribes to arrange and copy. The inference seems to me rather to be this: that Verrius took one author at a time, or commentaries on him, and arranged the notes which he made or extracted in alphabetical order, and that the whole of each letter is an aggregate of such separate series of authors. No doubt Varro pursued the same method in the seventh book of the *De Lingua Latina*, only on a much smaller scale. For in this book, which is devoted exclusively to the consideration of words used by the poets, we find a decided tendency to place together quotations from the same author. In § 6, 7, 8, 9 there are two from Ennius, and so in § 12-13; in § 14-15 there are two from Accius, in § 19, 20, 21 three from Ennius, in § 22, 23 two from Pacuvius, in § 32-33 two from Ennius, in § 35, 36, 37 three from Ennius, in § 41-46 four from Ennius, in § 48, 49 two from the same author, in § 54-58 five from Plautus, in § 61-64 four from Plautus, in § 66-70 five from Plautus, in § 77-79 three from Plautus, in § 87-88 two from Pacuvius, in § 95-96 two from Matius, in § 98-99 two from Plautus, in § 100-101 two from Ennius, in § 103-106 four from Plautus and two from Ennius, in § 108 twelve from Naevius.

It has been said before that each letter in the work of Verrius was originally divided into several *libri* or books. I hardly know whether it is possible to trace any sign of this division in the fragmentary work which we now possess. It is, however, worth noticing that in several letters there is more than one series of quotations from the same author; thus under *N* we have a first Plautine series p. 161-2, and a second p. 165, and on p. 162 a first Catonian series, and a second p. 169. So under *O* there are two series from Ennius, the first p. 187, the second p. 198, and the same phenomenon recurs elsewhere. May we infer that in these cases Verrius was making extracts from different glossaries, in each of which he found series of quotations from the same authors? And is there any connection between these different series and the separate *libri* into which the letters were divided? There are numerous instances in Paulus and Festus of a word being commented on twice. This phenomenon is easily explained by the facts to which I have already endeavored to call attention. The

double glosses owe their existence to the accident that Verrius found a word first in one and then in another author; thus *patulus bos* is mentioned in a Plautine series p. 221, and in another p. 229.

The method of arrangement according to authors meets us again in the works of the philological writers of the second and third centuries A. D., Aulus Gellius, Julius Romanus and Nonius; and I hope also to be able to show that there are traces of it in some of the Vergilian criticisms of Macrobius. This fact must be taken into consideration in investigating the authorities used by these writers, and may sometimes be found of importance in determining their relation to Verrius Flaccus.

But before attempting to trace the fortunes of Verrius' work in the first five centuries A. D., it will be well to say a word or two on its position in Roman literature, and on its value for the purposes of Latin scholarship in our own day.

In the *De Verborum Significatu* the first systematic attempt was made in the history of Roman literature to form an alphabetical encyclopaedia of interpretation, grammar and antiquities. Previous scholars had amassed an enormous amount of information upon separate subjects, but in a form that was neither attractive nor always easily accessible to the literary world. Varro, the greatest of Roman scholars and antiquarians, wrote in a style and adopted an arrangement which made reference to his work exceedingly difficult. The advantages of an alphabetical arrangement in the case of a work of general reference, such as that of Verrius Flaccus was intended to be, need not be pointed out.

But, as we have seen, Verrius did not strictly observe an alphabetical order beyond the first letters of the words. His book still bore traces of its origin from separate commentaries, treatises and monographs. Under every letter there are the clearest indications, where the hand of the epitomator has left anything but the barest skeleton, that the same authors were cited in single series. It would appear further that each letter included more than one series from the same author, and was divided, in some manner which we cannot now ascertain, into separate *libri* or sections. Thus the *De Verborum Significatu*, though in its general character an encyclopaedia, did not altogether lose the interest attaching to a literary production.

When we examine the relation of Verrius' work to that of the scholars into the fruits of whose labor he entered, we find that he is by no means to be set down as a mere compiler. There can hardly be a doubt that the notes upon Cato were the result of his

own studies, and this was probably the case also with his notes on Vergil, and perhaps with those on Cicero, Lucretius and Catullus. That he had views of his own on points of grammar and etymology is proved by the statements of later writers, who mention his name with respect as that of an independent authority. And it would thus be unjust, taking all things into consideration, to deny him a place among the best writers of the great literary epoch to which he belonged.

And, as far as we know, his work was never superseded or displaced except by abridgments of itself. This fact is due partly to its real merits and its wide compass, partly to the course of literary history. The work of Verrius belongs to a time when the science and art of grammar were as yet not quite definitely separated from the cognate branches of literature. There must have been many notes of Verrius Flaccus, if we may trust his epitomators, which in a later age would have been relegated from a dictionary to a grammar. In the hands of the scholars of the first century, such as Remmius Palaemon and Valerius Probus, grammar was developed into a separate art, and no subsequent attempt was made, on a scale worthy of the enterprise, to reëmbodify the results of grammatical study in a comprehensive lexicon.

In its relation to modern philology, the work of Verrius may be considered from two points of view, as a quarry of information for the student of Latin, and as offering several unsolved problems for constructive criticism. As a quarry of information it cannot be said even yet to be exhausted. The difficulties of Latin etymology are immensely increased by the fact that many important Latin words seem to have attained to their ordinary usage quite independently of their possible cognates in the kindred Indo-germanic languages. For most of the important occasions of life the Italians developed a vocabulary of their own long after their separation from their brethren of India, Greece, and the North and West of Europe. It is therefore often merely a barren toil to set Latin words side by side with their supposed cognates, unless we also take care strictly to interrogate the Latin language itself as to the sense in which the Italians generally accepted and employed them. Yet how little do we really know of this general acceptance and usage! How can we estimate adequately the loss which Latin letters have sustained in the destruction (to take a single instance) of most of the works of Varro! All the more need in an age like ours, in which the spirit of research is happily alive, to cling to such relics as we still

possess of Italian antiquity. For the student of this subject Verrius Flaccus is still a great authority, and the words even of Paulus must often be conned and conned again before the mind of the etymologist or antiquarian can be made up.

This being so, it is clear how important a problem it is for the critic to constitute what remains of the text of Verrius Flaccus on a sound basis. Something remains to be done even with the epitomes of Paulus and Festus. But there is a more difficult and delicate problem, the partial solution of which is not, I think, beyond the reach of modern scholarship. This is to determine to what extent the glosses in Paulus and Festus can be supplemented by the remains of the original work of Verrius which may be found in later writers, *who drew, not upon the abridgment of Festus, but upon other excerpts or abridgments*, or upon the *De Verborum Significatu* itself. In a second paper I hope to be able to point out generally the line which such an investigation should follow, and in particular to notice some of the quotations from Verrius which are to be found in Quintilian, Pliny, Suetonius, Gellius, Nonius, Macrobius and Placidus.

HENRY NETTLESHIP.